



IFW

2730 Glenbrook
Saint Clair Shores, MI
48082
(586)554-1707
Application No. 10/661,339

September 2, 2004

Commissioner for Patents
Joseph Pelham,
Primary Examiner, USPTO
Group Art Unit 3742
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I have reviewed your Office Action Summary on my application number listed above, and I have also reviewed the patents numbered: US Pat. 2546983, US Pat. 3549861, and US Pat. 3931494 including the prior art in conjunction with your decision on the rejections of claims 1-6. I would like to approach this matter by describing the uniqueness of my invention compared to the three applications listed. I have enclosed the copies of claims and statements made in the mentioned articles, along with my explanation of why this invention differs from them. Certainly by the end of this response you will better understand the position of my invention, versus what was thought to be an obvious to other applications. First off I would like to say as for my invention I have carefully considered any and all safety issues, convenient usage of space contained within it, and the versatility of being able to contain solid food as well as liquids. The design and construction of my invention is quite simple, and effective. All three referenced patents listed (US' 983, US' 861, and US' 494) make references to their containers as being used for liquids, semi liquids, or drinking. Starting with US' 494 it's application is general to certain types of containers, disclosed in the abstract it describes it to be used with either a cup, pot, bowl or the like. (I have included the area, which is highlighted, and I have mentioned.) Also note its battery compartment is completely sealed, only to be used with a rechargeable battery (needing a source of electrical energy).

Next, US' 983, it's obvious to me that the materials used are different for the inner and outer compartments, (note I have enclosed a highlighted copy of the statement made within the patent.) The application used for the coil heater uses two connections to prongs, and it should be also noted that it is used to carry an electrical current for it's energy supply, not a battery. Items 14, and 33 are not adequate enough to be useful to the overall invention itself. It also lacks the space

saving features which my invention boasts within the said area. As with the outer cap it does not show useful/adequate space as a vessel to carry solids. In reference to US' 861, the power cord, 39, is stored within a bottom compartment and its structure is based on carrying an electrical current for energy. Note the inner receptacle, 56, is obviously different than the invention in question for patent as a heating coil unit is seated within the innermost compartment, 56. As 80, the threaded inner cap is only referenced to twice and has only one use, simply to close the inner receptacle. Also note it must be removed during the heating process. Also the threads of said inner cap is on the outer edge of the neck. With my invention the threads are clearly depicted within the inner most area of the neck.

All three applications referred to in your decision depict uses of electrical energy, as electrical energy is used to recharge the battery of US' 494. My application clearly defines an invention for use with battery power only. The heating coils are referenced in my application in Claim 3 as to the materials used where as the three referenced do not. Also note the heating coils to my application are only used encompassing the entire side walls of the inner receptacle. In order to adapt the battery of US' 494 to the container of US' 983, US' 983 would have to be changed of the materials used for its inner compartment, 62, (silver coating). Also note the comment within US' 983, (I have enclosed and highlighted those areas for you to reference) it states: "This construction may be used only when the substances filling the container are poor conductors of electricity." The construction of my invention is clearly stated to be used with solids and is not particular to only heating liquid or semi liquid materials. Also you mentioned the pressure release valve, please take into consideration that most/all safety aspects of my invention have been closely considered and adapted into my invention, whereas the three referenced articles do not. The safety issues of all three are questionable compared to mine due to the fact that using electrical energy with liquid contents without great care/caution, can cause serious injury, (i.e. electrical shock, burns, etc.)

To adapt the threaded inner cap, metal inner receptacle, and power cord of US' 861 to the container of US' 983 would once again bring into question safety issues. US' 861 does not completely depict ample definition of its inner cap, but from view of the art it would not be worthy of modification, since it would take up more space of the inner compartment. This would reduce the amount of contents placed/held within it. US' 861 has a highly complicated construction, whereas mine has a simple and more effective use of space, reducing any over heated wires. Therefore my invention is unique due to the fact it is simple in its construction, has adequate space for the contents contained. Note also that it is not just used for liquids and can be used safely everyday by the consumer. Also note the heating coils from all three referenced inventions' prior art, do not have the same inner compartment application as mine. In FIG. 5 of US' 983 it is only applied to the bottom of the inner compartment. In FIG. 3 of US' 494 it is only used on one side wall and the bottom wall. In FIG. 2, and FIG. 3 of US 861 it is housed within a cylinder at the bottom of the inner compartment.

Both inner caps of US' 861, and US' 983 could not be worthy of any modifications due to the fact it would conflict with ample storage of the contents. In short, as with all three (US' 983, US' 861, and US' 494) conclude the use of electrical energy, therefore making mine unique simply due to the fact it removes the necessity for electrical energy (obtainable household batteries will constitute the power generated for my invention). It complies with most/all safety issues of possible burn injuries, electrical shock, etc. Also in Claim 6 of my application I have also noted the use of heat safe plastics (which are used to house the inner most metal receptacle), making it

safe to handle versus the three referenced patents. Also note the adequate spacing required to the noted container for solids as well as liquids, the three referenced articles specifically are designed for liquids and semi liquids. My invention has applications which cannot be applied to other inventions without degrading the issues of safety, and relevance to contain a large amount of contents placed within to be heated safely for consumer use. Please reconsider your decision, as I will patiently await your response for the next course of action. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Claudine Iannucci". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned to the right of the typed name.

Claudine Iannucci,

Inventor